

The reference in this interrogatory to the communication in the Union of September 12, 1848, makes such communication a legitimate subject of the discussion before the House. I have heard the Union of that date (and I think it up) and I have seen the communication in the Union of that date. Of which of these did the chairman of the committee decide the authorship? I confess I know not,—nor do I believe does any other member of the committee, except the chairman. It must have been either the Union, or the communication in the Union, or the chairman's own suggestion. It is a matter of no weighty matters—charges perhaps of a serious character against General Taylor or other prominent Whig or else the chairman surely would not now esteem it of such preeminent importance as to make a refusal to answer it a subject of discussion. I have seen the communication of a special report to the House, asking for its advice in the premises, and follow such report with its resolution requiring that the recusant be arraigned at the next House. I will place in the communications, and see which if any, contains *material* entitling it to the importance the report has given it. The first is upon the subject of the pamphlet file of General Cass. It is precluded, however, by the fact that the Union states that the author of that pamphlet. As the chairman and committee knew that a author was without asking Mr. Ritchie, this course cannot be the communication referred to in the resolution. The second is an article in the Union, in which the veto; one which any man would esteem it an infliction to read before election, and which could not have the least importance attached that event. The next is a very laudable good-natured article, charging General Taylor with being "a little out of his mind," because of his confusion in one of his letters, his incompetency to perform the duties of the Presidency. The next two are from abroad—one from Ohio and one from Virginia, both of which are of a local character, in which it cannot be supposed the chairman wishes to inquire. The next and last is headed, "A other gun spiked." The Michigan witness blows such high," and is devoted to refuting charges against General Taylor. I suppose the Michigan witness was referred to in the interrogatory. My reason for so supposing is, not that the article contains anything of present or much past importance, but that the "Michigan witness," who was so unceremoniously blown such high, was a person entirely unknown to the Union at a period not very remote from the time at which the

interrogatory was put to Mr. Ritchie and the interrogator, I fancy, was put at his (Michigan witness) instigation, for the purpose of enabling him to ascertain who had taken the liberty to "blow" him "sky-high."

None of these communications can have had any other effect than to excite the indignation of the committee, and even that was wholly lost after the election, leaving them unworthy the attention of the House, or the committee, or any one of its members. Then why did the chairman of the committee, after the election, desire to tempt to create a mountain from such a mole-hill? The House and the country have a right to demand an answer to this question. As a member of the committee, I shall answer it to the best of my knowledge and belief. The reason is to be found, not in the communications themselves, but in the desire of the chairman to know its author, but in the nature and trifling character of the facts elicited by the committee; in the ridiculous position in which the party majority (Whigs) of the House placed themselves by their own conduct; in a single disreputable act against any number of Democratic office-holders. They found (in language which I think the honorable chairman has been heard to use) that the investigation was all "tomfoolery;" and they wished it to quench the fire which might be kindled by the report of the committee, in fact, in which they would have little to report except their self-stultification. Hence this report in part was made, with the full expectation that this trifling character would induce the House to lay it upon the table, and thus prevent the exposure of the fact that nothing more could be done by the committee, as the House had refused to compel witnesses to answer.

That such was the true motive dictating the report, I infer further from one of the closing sentences of the remarks of the chairman, (Mr. STANTLEY) after sending the report to your desk, and which sentence I have already read.

[illegible]

any assailing him, the gentleman from Maryland affected above such a man, will be apt to be charged by the country to the arrogance of vanity.

"It is folly," he said, "to assail such a man as I," he hoarsely uttered slanderous, to assert of him, as did the gentleman from Maryland, that he had been engaged "for forty years in the propagation of slander against all noble and truthful men;" and to intimate that no gentleman could propound interpretative "to such a man, the answer to which would involve a deeper degree of degradation of character than that which he has long since brought upon himself." Such language applied to such a man can only rest upon its author's head and shoulders, and sink, if "Upon his brow the sunbeams [not] ashamed to sit."

Sir, whatever the member from Maryland may say of Mr. Ritchey, the friends of the latter gentleman—(as I have already said, and as I have no doubt, as a matter of acquaintance with him)—his friends can truly exclaim for him the possession of those qualities which constitute the gentleman, and which though possessed—(as I doubt not they are) by the gentleman from Maryland, are not to be found in the same measure in the gentleman from whose years, services, and talent it might be rank him assailant.

The honorable member charged that the "Union" was "known to be the lowest, sewer of corruption"—"a cesspool of corruption," and that it was "leading the people by the wrong way to the public eye." No one, who has been long a reader of that paper, will believe that so much "sewer" matter was ever admitted into its columns as to be found in the honorable member's yesterday's speech, nor ever to be admitted while under its present editorial management. I have no doubt that the honorable member was right in his opinion, and in his defensive in this speaking of Mr. Ritchie; said he was not in the habit of attacking any one; and challenge of any gentleman to point out a single instance in which he had committed such an offence.

Let us hear Mr. Speaker what the facts are in this case, and who was really the first to attack. I find in his speech of July 16, (last,) which I now hold in my hand, that he twice distinctly charges Mr. Ritchie, with having committed an offence, and that he says that the gentleman understand the meaning of language! I charge the perpetration of a "gross swindle" upon a man, is it not a charge which, if substantiated, makes him a swindler, a villain, in the estimation of the public mind? Is it not a charge which, if true, would lead him to go unrepelled. So much volubility as the gentleman possesses should be accompanied with a good memory. He should remember what he does say. "Many a man's tongue shakes out its master's undoing." It was not at the time that he was speaking, that he was aware that he assailed could reply—through his paper—the assailed now loudly shouts forth, like another injured man whose wrongs are recorded by an English dramatist.

"He hath wronged me, indeed he hath; at a word he hath wronged me, indeed he hath; at a word he hath wronged me."

I seek in vain in this editorial of the Union, (holding up the paper,) in answer to the gentleman's charge of "swindle," for evidence of the paper being a "sewer through which the vilest slanders find their way." It is not here. I find the following:

[illegible]

Somehow," said his honorable member from Maryland of the bribery and corruption in connection with the election of 1860, "it is not possible that either corruption or bribery in raising or using such funds (of which there is no evidence before the committee,) was common to both parties. The funds were raised by the friends of the administration, and the gentleman is really desirous of exposing stamped bribery—holding it up to the view and condemnation of the country. I respectfully direct his attention to an attempt at bribery on the part of a prominent member of the opposition—Mr. Smith—an attempt to bribe the members of an entire State (Indiana,) by holding out to them a conditional prospect of office—conditional that they should strengthen the ranks of a "big administration" by sending to the front of the "big administration" a man who had been spared and proper reward meant to him who offered —as people's contempt. If the gentleman from Maryland wishes to expose corruption, let him turn his attention to the fact that the members of the opposition have been turned out of office for interfering

actions, and things turned in that they might interfere. Among these instances I would particularly desire his attention to the case of my friend on my left, from Kentucky, [Mr. STANTON,] who was turned out of a post office, and immediately afterwards the office was seized by Trumbull's Whig electioneering documents, many of which were to be distributed by his Whig successor.

Mr. STANTON. There was no evidence that the postmaster (his successor) connived at this matter.

Mr. FITCH. That makes no difference. They were sent by a leader of the Whig party for that purpose, and the new appointee knew what was expected of him. I am not going to say that I am a member of this committee, and I will occupy the attention of the House no longer. We desired and attempted to enlarge the powers of the committee, that we might examine into the conduct of the members of the committee, and holders. This enlargement was refused. We wished "the whole truth" to be made public—not a partial and garbled version of it. We desired, wherever it existed among officials, to ferret it out without regard to party. We desired to know whether the Democratic, to the condemnation of the Country, that the proper correction could be applied.

[For the Indiana State Sentinel.]

**National Convention of Officers of Institutions  
for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb.**

NEW YORK, August 31, 1850.

NATHANIEL BOLTON, Esq.:

*My Dear Sir,*—Supposing that your readers may be interested in a very brief account of the Convention of Officers of various Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in the United States, which has now just closed its session, I have concluded to jot down a few of the more important items of discussion and action.

This is the first meeting of the kind which has been held on our side of the Atlantic; and its results cannot fail to have a favorable influence on the future progress of the cause. The following is a list of the officers and delegates:

President—Hon. Christopher Morgan, Albany.  
Vice-Presidents—Rev. W. W. Turner, Conn.; Dr. H. Peet, New York; Joshua Foster, Pa.; J. S. Brown, N. H.; George N. C. Thomas, Officer, Ill.; O. P. Fanning, Georgia.  
Secretaries—J. S. Peet, New York, and L. H. Woodruff, Conn.

The following are the Delegates present:  
From the American Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb at Hartford, Conn.—Rev. W. H. Turner, Messrs. L. H. Woodruff, W. Chilton, and Rev. Samuel Porter.  
From the Pennsylvania Institution—Messrs. J. Foster, Jr., Benj. C. Pettigrew, and J. Mount.  
From the Indiana Institution—Mr. J. S. Brown, Superintendent.

From the Illinois Institution—Mr. Thomas Officer, Principal, and N. M. Totten.  
From the North Carolina Institution—Mr. W. D. Cooke, Principal.  
From the Georgia Institution—Mr. O. P. Fannin, Principal.  
From the New York Institution—H. P. Peet, LL. D., President of the Institution, and Professors D. E. B. Elliott, J. A. Carey, O. W. Morris, J. Van Nostrand, T. Gallaudet, J. S. Peet, E. Peet, and J. H. Benedict; also, P. M. Wetmore, first Vice President of the New York Institution, and J. C. Brooks, Secretary.  
From the Rev. G. T. Bedell, Israel Russell, Esq., and Shepherd Knapp, Esq., members of the Board of Directors.  
Hon. Christopher Morgan, Secretary of the State of New York, and Superintendent of Common Schools.  
Rev. H. N. Brinsmade, D.D., of Newark, N. J.; Rev. J. H. Pettینگel, of Essex, Conn.; G. D. Loring, of Boston; and J. B. Burnett, of N. J., former Instructors of the Deaf and Dumb.  
The Convention adjourned its sittings during three days, and its deliberations were marked with peculiar interest. Among its members were men who have grown gray in the profession of teaching mutes, and whose names will be cherished with admiration and respect by the coming years. Others, in the meridian of life were there, whose highest ambition is to equal their honored seniors. Others, still, before whom the profession is just opening with all its possibilities.  
Among the least happy incidents of the meeting was the presence of a number of distinguished gentlemen not engaged in the business of instruction, but connected with the supervision of Institutions in the capacity of Trustees. It was regretted that the Convention was not open to this class of delegates, the Hon. Christopher Morgan was appointed President, and we had abundant cause

be satisfied with our choice.

The president, Peet, of the New York Institution, took part in the Convention, and read several highly important and interesting papers. Prof. Turner, of the Hartford Asylum, was the oldest Instructor present, having spent more than thirty years in teaching the deaf and dumb.

The most remarkable deliberations were likely to witness the most profound attention. One of the very best articles read was by Prof. Woodruff, on the "Moral and Religious Education of Mutes." Essays were also presented by Professor G. Haudet, sen., the founder of the American Institute, and by Prof. J. M. Smith, a distinguished gentleman, though his mother and wife are mutes, and by Professors Bartlett, Cary, Van Nostrand, and J. L. Peet. When these papers are published (as they will be) the proceedings of this Convention will be found to contain a vast amount of information on subjects of the utmost philosophical importance and interest—subjects not hitherto presented to the public eye.

The debates were in general conducted orally, but were also interspersed into signs, and useful means of communication. The deaf and dumb gentlemen frequently participated in the discussion, using their own peculiar and elegant language of signs, which were, of course, at once understood by all the teachers, but translated into English by the interpreters. It is to be regretted that spectators as well did not understand signs. The questions as propounded by the Chair were rendered into signs, and all (mutes as well as speaking delegates) voted with uplifted hands. It was determined, that on the subject of the "Education of Mutes," the following resolutions: each being entitled to one vote, and an addi-

donal vote for every twenty pupils.

The age at which mutes should be received for instruction excited considerable discussion. The delegates from the various States and Territories, from Massachusetts may be sent at the age of eight years, took strong ground against the practice, and were unanimously sustained by those from other Institutions. It was generally agreed that the age of ten years, or thereabouts, would be the best. It was a great utility to receive pupils older than the age of ten years. Some of the delegates were in favor of fixing the lowest limit at twelve years; but they would have been voted down, had they pressed the matter. It was also agreed that the age of fifteen years for instruction of the deaf and dumb in articulation was incidentally alluded to, and found to be generally practiced in no American Asylum. This dispute has however resulted from the failure of a faithful transcription of the report of the Convention. The report presented by Mr. Barnett, of New Jersey, himself a mute, on a syllabic alphabet. Many Teachers think that the next discovery in our art will be made in this direction. The most serious and important of the subjects discussed, was the duration of the course, and the food of light thrown upon the subject. Could metaphysicians have known what any experienced Teacher of mutes *does know* on this subject, the press would have been relieved from the necessity of discussing the "Nature, Length, and "National State of Man," etc.

The length of the course of instruction was considered, and seven years was fixed with entire unanimity, as the best and most judicious term of instruction to be maintained. The practice on the part of friends, which to some extent exists in most Institutions, of taking pupils away before finishing their education, was severely and justly condemned. The subject of receiving mutes at the age of eight years, was also discussed, and a majority of the Convention seemed in favor of admitting such persons, at least for a year or two, to the advantages of Asylums, if for no other purpose, than to at least secure to them a knowledge of the funda-

The propriety of obtaining from the General Government a donation of the public lands was duly considered and a set of resolutions, prepared by myself on the subject, was adopted without dissent, and ordered to be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the House of Representatives. It is strange that while the Government has given the public lands for almost every purpose under the Heaven, no general donation has been made to the deaf and dumb. It is a subject which has been brought before the delegation in Congress, in accordance with the request and instructions of her Legislature, are right on this subject.

It was also determined to establish a Periodical, to be devoted to the interests of deaf mute education. The title is to be the "American Annals of the Deaf and Dumb." It will be issued quarterly, at Hartford; and will be in every respect worthy of public patronage. It will be edited by a gentleman whose distinguished attainments, as a scholar and matured experience as a teacher are sufficient guarantees that it will be well sustained. This Review will be one of unsurpassed interest to every instructor of the deaf and dumb, and to every one who feels any interest in the instruction of the unfortunate deaf and dumb. The subscription price is very low, only one dollar per annum, payable in advance. No one can doubt the interest which will be manifested in the publication, and the return to Indianapolis to receive and transmit to the accomplished editor the names of numerous subscribers. It ought, perhaps, to be remarked, that the content of the *Quarterly* will contain not only the contributions of the various instructors, but also the contributions of the various

the country and will among other things, test of the philosophy of the human mind, as developed by the Deaf and Dumb, their state previous to education, the process and results of their instruction, together with a general review of the current literature pertaining to this branch of science. No Teacher Professor in College, Clergymen, professional men, or curious enquirers after the ways of the human mind ought to be without this work.

Among the matters of personal interest to myself, in addition to meeting with my many Eastern professional acquaintances, was taking by the hand my esteemed friend and former associate Thomas Officer, Esq., of the State of New York, a brilliant and able man. This pleasure was still further increased by the acquaintance of W. D. Cooke, Esq., the Principal of the North Carolina Institution, and O. P. Fanning, Esq., Principal of the lately established Georgia Institution; both, apparently, gentlemen admirably adapted to successfully discharge the arduous duties devolving upon

Would that every citizen of Indiana could have been present to have heard, from every quarter, the strong enunciation bestowed upon the generous liberality, and sympathizing kindness of the unfortunate deaf and dumb. A touching address was the subject alluded to, in terms of the highest eulogy. I own I felt proud of our State, and so would any of her citizens who could have listened to the deliberations of the Convention. Indiana has done much for the deaf and dumb, and Long John, the purer sacrifice was ever presented to Heaven, than the willing offering she has placed on the altar of public benevolence. Accursed through future generations be the land of the heartless demagogue, who would seek to quench the flame of benevolence by the liveliest charity, or, to fling in its stead the ignis fatuus of his own damnable ambition.

The thanks of all friends of Mute education are due to the President and Officers of the New York Institution, for the kind and liberal manner in which they originated the call for the Convention, as well as for the kindly and courteous hospitalities which they extended to the delegates while in session.

It is but a short time, not more than one year from this time, will be assembled at some point in the East, perhaps at Hartford; while it is universally conceded, that the one two years hence must come over the Alleghanies, most probably, to Indianapolis.

With sentiments of the highest regard,  
Yours truly  
JAMES S. BROWN.

**The Texas Boundary and New Mexico.**  
The following is the vote on ordering the bill to a third reading. It will be seen that Indiana was right side up on this question:

The Speakers declared the result—years 108, may 98, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Aberton, Alston, Anderson, Anderson, Anderson, Beale, Baker, Howe, Bowlin, Boyd, Brack, Briggs, Brooks, William J. Brown, Buel, Casey, Butler, E. Carrington, Casey, George Alfred Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Casey, Cluender, Williamson K. W. Cobb, Deberry, Dinnick, Disney, Dyer, Duncan, Edwards, Edwards, Edwards, Edwards, Edwards, Edwards, Gery, Gilmore, Gorman, Geo. H. Grinnell, Hall, Hammond, G. Harris, Thomas L. Harris, Howard, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hogland, Houston, Howard, Isham, Andrew Johnson, Jas. L. Johnson, Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, George K. King, Lester, Levin, Littlefield, Jobb, Johnson, Johnson, Johnson, Johnson, Johnson, McDowell, McKissock, McLanahan, Robert M. McLane, Finis E. McLean, McMillen, Morehead, Morton, Nelson, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Peaslee, Phoenix, Pitman, Potter, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rose, Rick P. Stanton, Richard B. Stanton, Strong, Taylor, Thomas, James Thompson, John B. Thompson, Thurman, Toombs, Underhill, Walden, Watkins, Wellborn, White, Whittley, Wildrick, William, Wilson and Young.

NAVY—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Ash, Averett, Baker, Bennett, Bingham, Booth, Bowdoin, Albert G. Brown, Burrows, Burt, Thomas B. Butler, Joseph Bailey, Calvin, Campbell, Carter, Canning, Canine, Chandler, Child, Clark, Cleveland, O. C. Dixon, Doty, Durkee, N. Evans, Featherston, Fowler, Giddings, Gort, Hallaway, Harlan, Harlan, Sampson, W. Harris, Hobard, Henry, Holladay, Holmes, Hovey, Hovey, Hovey, Hovey, Hovey, Hovey, Jackson, R. W. Johnson, Julian, J. G. King, John A. King, Preston King, La Sere, Horace Mann, Matteson, M. G. Mangier, McQueen, McWillie, Menahan, Meade, Meritt, Mendenhall, Mendenhall, Mendenhall, Orr, Otis, Peck, Phelps, Powell, Putnam, Reid, Reynolds, Rockwell, Root, Rumsey, J. R. Sackett, Sawtelle, Schenck, Schoderlaker, Sinton, Silvester, Sprague, Thaddeus, Thayer, Thayer, Thayer, Thayer, Thayer, Van Dyke, Venable, Vinton, Waldo, Wallace, Wentworth, and Woodward—89.

So the bill was ordered to be read a third time.

[It was the Texas Boundary bill that the Senate, as announced by Mr. Tilden, was adding the bill of that body with several verbal alterations, providing a territorial government for New Mexico, and as further amended, at the instance of Mr. Toombs, declaring that the territory of New Mexico was not to be deprived of his life, liberty, or property, except by the judgment of his peers and the laws of the land.]

**The Smithsonian Institute.**

We make the following extracts from a sketch in the Washington City Directory for 1850, which appears to have been prepared with considerable care:

"The Smithsonian Institution derives its name and endowment from James Smithson, Esq., of England. Mr. Smithson was a son of the first Earl of Northumberland. He was educated at Oxford, where he distinguished himself by his scientific attainments. In 1787, the year after taking his master's degree, he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. To the 'Philosophical Transactions,' he contributed at intervals some eight or nine papers. He was a fixed resident in England, and not a journeyman. The last years of his life were spent on the continent. He died at Genoa, June 27, 1829. From the property received from his mother, and the ample annuity allowed him by his father, his frugality enabled him to accumulate a fortune, which at the time of his death amounted to £100,000. By his last will, he directed that the income of this property (after deducting some small annuities) should be paid to his nephew, Henry James Hungerford, during his life, and that the property should descend to his children, if he had any, absolutely and forever. In case of the death of my said nephew without leaving any issue, I direct that the death of my said child or children he may have had under the age of 21 years, or intestate, I then bequeath the whole of my property, (subject to an annuity, &c.,) to the United States of America, to found at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institute, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of know-

"Such are the words of the will, and the only words of Smithsonian which have come to us relating to this remarkable bequest. Young Hungerford died at Pisa, on the 5th of June, 1835, without issue. The event thus occurred in which the claim of the United States to the bequest was established. Dr. Charles Drexler, Philadelphia, appointed agent for the United States, recovered the fund in 1838, amounting to \$515,169. The act establishing the Smithsonian Institute, was passed 10th August, 1846. The cost of the building is limited (with furniture, grating, the grounds, &c.) to \$1,000,000. The Government has contributed to the purchase of the original building funds, so as to save \$150,000 of the building fund, which, when added to the original fund, will make 675,000 dollars, yielding nearly \$40,000 per annum. This income, with all sums received from other sources, is to be applied to the purchase of books, and to the two great methods of increasing and diffusing knowledge—the first by publications, researches, and lectures, the second by collections in literature and art. The building is in the late Norman or Lombard style. It consists of a centre and two wings, and by colonnades, is divided into three parts, 445 feet long, and its greatest breadth 132 feet. It is adorned by nine towers, the highest of which is 145 feet. The central portion of the building contains on the first floor a Library, 134 feet by 50—divided into alcoves which are crossed by galleries, and a Hall for Philosophical Apparatus, 134 feet by 50. On the second floor are lecture rooms, work shops, offices, &c. In the Western Wing galleries of art, one of which will be a reading room," &c.

✿ Sheridan was never free from pecuniary embarrassments. As he was one day hacking his face with a dull razor, he turned to his eldest son (who was a clup of the old black) and said: "Tom, if you open any more oysters with my razor, I'll cut you off with a shilling." "Very well, father," retorted Tom, "but where will the shilling come from?"

THE LIFE OF AN EXQUISITE.—He gets up leisurely; breakfasts comfortably; reads the paper regularly; dresses fashionably; talks insipidly; dines considerably; drinks superfluously; smokes elegantly; lives uselessly; dies reluctantly; is buried lugubriously; and is missed by nobody.

☛ Make hay while the sun shines.

**W**ALDEN SAGUE STROP, An excellent  
and Agree, just received and for sale at. SIDDA  
June 10

**P**AINTE MILLS AND SPICE MILLS. A  
tent on hand, and for sale low at. SIDDA  
June 1 South side Washington street, under

**BLACKFORD'S REPORTS.** Of cases argued in the Supreme Court of Judicature of the vol. viii., containing the cases from May term, 1847, both inclusive.      jun 1

and determined  
State of Indiana,  
16, to No. 10  
ROSS & RAY.